

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

VOL. VIII, No. 20

NOVEMBER 29, 1948

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

Lessons from the Election

BY the time these words appear in print, the pundits and pollsters will doubtless have tired (as well they might) of analyzing the recent election, and turkey will have replaced crow on the tables of most of those who make their living telling the people how they ought to think and what they are going to do. It would be bad sportsmanship to crow over the Cassandras-in-reverse, and bad religion ("whether there be prophecies, they shall fail"; "forgive seventy times seven"). Obviously, weather forecasting is a more exact science than predicting human affairs, as it was in Jesus' time (Luke 12:54-56).

Before the meaning of the election has been thoroughly obscured by special alibis and diverse interpretations, it is in order to draw a few significant lessons from it. On the negative side, the election demolished or called into serious question some of the most cherished axioms of American politics. It does not appear to be true that the people always vote *against* something, and that elections are therefore best interpreted as a registration of grievances. Many citizens doubtless voted against the Eightieth Congress and against Mr. Dewey, but the majority voted *for* the major party and candidate whose platform and campaign were positive rather than ambiguous and non-committal. Perhaps the electorate is less querulous and more discerning than was supposed.

It clearly is not true that there is an inevitable and uniform cycle in the control of the American government by the major parties. To be sure, no party has hitherto remained continuously in power for more than sixteen years, but the assertion that "it's time for a change" appears in retrospect to have been campaign propaganda or wishful thinking rather than an accurate description of a quasi-natural law. There may be cycles in politics as in the seasons, but at this writing the Democrats do not appear to face a hard winter.

It is not true that "campaigns don't count," or that party regularity and the voter's mind are both so monolithic that the fireworks of the campaign cannot affect them. The opinion polls may have been substantially correct in their measurements of voter-preference in August—there are numerous other lines of evidence which indicate that they were. But

people have a way of changing their minds, even at the last moment when they walk into the voting booth. Mr. Truman's campaign, breaking most precedents concerning the dignity of the incumbent President, undoubtedly changed opinions; Mr. Dewey's campaign, pitched on assumptions about the dignity of an incoming President, also changed opinions, to the detriment of the candidate. The snobbish inference frequently drawn from this contrast in methods, to the effect that American people were not intelligent and sophisticated enough to appreciate Mr. Dewey's tactics, is a libel against the electorate and is hardly worthy of heirs of Abraham Lincoln.

Many other venerable maxims likewise were shattered: it is not necessarily true that "people like to get on the bandwagon," or that "the rural vote is largely Republican," or that "there is no labor vote," or that "a small vote favors the Republicans," or that "the New Deal is dead." All in all, the political landscape is almost as cluttered with broken clichés as with prostrate pollsters.

On the positive side, the meaning of the election remains to be determined. Editors and columnists, chastened only temporarily, are already advising, predicting, and probably obscuring the shape of things to come from the Eighty-first Congress. Many of them find it hard to believe that the Democratic Platform and Mr. Truman's campaign pledges are to be taken seriously.

So far as the election itself was concerned, two positive results of significant spiritual proportions appear to have been established. In the first place, there is a new sense of quiet competence and power among the people, and a revived faith that the citizens of a democracy cannot always be managed or bamboozled. In the second place, there is a fresh mood of expectation and of hope, as over against the pre-election sense of fatal drift toward domestic ossification and international chaos. It is too early to predict with assurance the uses to which Mr. Truman and his party will put their astonishing victory. But it is evident that the people have voted for that experimental attitude toward the future which was the essence of the New Deal, and which once before helped the nation to rise from the brink of despair.

L. P.

The Universal Church in God's Design

CLARENCE T. CRAIG

WHAT did Section One accomplish at Amsterdam? What actually emerged from this meeting of a large group of the theological leaders of the Christian Church? Were any significant steps taken in the direction of its unity?

First, a report was brought in on the thorny subject of the nature of the Church which was unanimously received and commended to the churches. That is worth stressing because never before has it been possible to avoid a separate paper from our Orthodox brethren. It should be emphasized because for two critical days it did not appear that any report was possible, and up to the very end the probability of a separate statement was real. The difficulties of a doctrinal statement by a body which includes Old Catholic, Anglo-Catholic, and Orthodox is naturally much greater than in a body which is exclusively Protestant. Some fundamentalists in this country lay the charge against the World Council that it is not an exclusively Protestant organization. When a larger unity is attempted, we must accept the greater difficulties involved. For ten days (counting from the preliminary meeting at Woudschoten) there were those who insisted that all the Section could do was to prepare a few paragraphs on the difficulty of the problems, and refer them to the Faith and Order Commission. Instead, a significant report was unanimously received.

Second, this report made it clear that *our agreements concerning the nature of the Church cover a very wide area*. Paradoxically, here lay one of the chief difficulties. If the agreements are so wide, why need the churches remain separate? Some felt very strongly that it was misleading to enumerate our agreements without putting them against the background of the basic cleavage which sets them in differing frameworks. Those who had not followed the genesis of the Report did not appreciate how a blurring of this cleavage would destroy the whole basis upon which the Report had been possible at all. The same misunderstanding is seen in some of the reports of the Assembly. The otherwise very able account in *The Christian Century* betrays the fact that its writer had not understood the situation which had called forth the crucial paragraph.

Thirdly, a careful analysis was made of the areas of disagreement. This is important in order to distinguish between those differences which are significant in keeping us apart, and the areas where the disagreements already cut across confessional lines. If members of the same church now find disagreement compatible with a single organization, there

should be no valid reason why the same disagreements might not continue *within* a united Church. At the same time, this analysis helped to show that even within our disagreements there are fundamental agreements. The very attempt to stress our differences brings us back to the underlying unity.

Fourthly, these delicate issues were discussed without bitterness or personal animosity in an atmosphere of Christian brotherhood. No cleavage was avoided or by-passed. There was no retreat into the realm of meaningless generalities. The differences were faced "within the family" in a spirit of mutual appreciation and understanding.

These were significant accomplishments. To them should be added a negative result. *It was not necessary even to oppose a primarily sociological understanding of the nature of the Church*. This does not mean that this approach is found among no Christians today. The point of view symbolized by the names of Hatch and Harnack, which was dominant in liberal Protestant circles from 1885-1915, is undoubtedly assumed by many individuals. But no responsible theologian advocated that position at Amsterdam, and no delegate publicly supported it. There were different interpretations of the biblical conception of the one People of God, but no one described the Church in terms of groups patterned after the religious societies of the ancient world.

At the same time, the limitations of the results should be clearly borne in mind. *It cannot be claimed that any major obstacle to the union of Christian bodies was overcome or removed*. It would have been completely unrealistic to have expected it. The World Council must have a much firmer foundation before it can safely attack any such problem. It will require the kind of thorough preparation which the Faith and Order Commission has under way, looking forward to a Conference in this area, probably in 1952. Yet, too great expectations should not be held even in regard to this gathering. Conferences can only register progress which has taken place, and that is determined by the action of official bodies on specific ecclesiastical issues. The attempt to carry through local unions will provide the test. Ceylon and North India will furnish the next proving ground. So long as theologians and ecclesiastics simply re-state the implication of traditional positions, no radical change can be anticipated. Only as the demand for unity is faced as a new situation can a "break through" come.

Though the nature of the Church presents a *theological* rather than a *sociological* question, there are

tensions which have their roots in the latter area. These will have to be faced in the days ahead. The tensions between free churches and state churches did not lie within the area of discussion of Section One at Amsterdam. Nevertheless, they will need to be faced within the World Council or full understanding will be impossible. Included in the Agenda of the preliminary draft report were the important topics of (1) the clash between regional responsibilities and confessional loyalties, and (2) the extremely difficult question of proselytizing among members of the same Council. The indignation of Baptists at the limitations on the freedom of their propaganda in predominantly Orthodox countries is only to be matched by the indignation of the Orthodox that missionary money should be devoted to stealing "their sheep." Here are thorny issues which could have brought shipwreck if premature pronouncements had been attempted.

Yet it is important to realize that sociological differences did not lie behind the cleavages which were faced, at least so far as I could see. The way in which one type of difference cut across the lines of another may be illustrated from the section omitted from the Report at almost the last minute. This made the assertion that the very name of the organization, World Council of Churches, indicated a situation which ought not to exist. Uniting in opposition to this were some Baptists, who feared that such an assertion would compromise their position that separate congregations were the only legitimate form of the Church, and some Lutherans, who believed in a state church, and who did not look forward to a time when such would no longer have a separate existence. Despite their fundamental difference regarding the political relationship of the Church, these groups found themselves together on a theological issue.

Relatively few of the American representatives at Amsterdam had given thoughtful consideration to the issues connected with the doctrine of the Church. Even more is that the case with the ministry and the membership of our churches. A great deal of education is needed in this field. During the past nine years there has been an American Theological Committee which has been entrusted by the Faith and Order Commission with the exploration of these questions. They have done good work. But that does not suffice for the urgent need of our time. Study processes must be developed in much wider areas of the Church. What we need is not more statements which are confessionally oriented, but statements which will be ecumenical in character. If we are unwilling to deny that those in other ecclesiastical bodies also belong to the Church, then we must accept our responsibility for defining the Church in terms that will include them. If we insist that this cannot be done, then our participation in the ecumenical movement must soon appear to be illogical and sentimental.

Realities

REINOLD VON THADDEN*

THE Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam, with its 1500 delegates, alternates, consultants and visitors, merely did what serious people had wanted to do since the end of the war, and which they wrongly considered a simple matter. It tried to bring "the World" and "the Church" face to face.

This is not the place to decide whether the outcome of that impressive fortnight, when the non-Roman-Catholic churches of the world assembled in Amsterdam, was a successful one. But we are all interested in the question, how to envisage this antagonism between church and world.

Do we really know what "the World" is, and are we so sure what "the Church" is, when we bring them face to face? It seems to me that there is a good deal of obscurity in our ideas of both, not only among people who stand outside the church but often, most of all, among Christians.

The average citizen takes it for granted that the world today is an unpleasant place. We share this conviction with most of our contemporaries in the same naïve way that Christians a few years ago maintained the exact opposite, and clung to the belief that the world in general was bright, cheerful, pleasant and hopeful.

At any rate, the world is not like that today. Nowhere. I do not refer only to the war-devastated countries of western, central and eastern Europe, where hundreds of towns have fallen into dust and ashes, where countless millions live in miserable poverty, and where millions have migrated on a scale hitherto unknown to history. All over the world we perceive the consequences of an apocalyptic catastrophe. Little by little the nations have begun to realize what they have lost in human lives, material, financial assets, political influence and above all in general security.

We are convinced that, in spite of everything, the

*** Editor's Note:** *We are glad to publish the above article by Dr. von Thadden. It has great value in itself and it is also of interest because it calls attention to a new kind of lay leadership that has emerged in the German Church in recent years. Dr. von Thadden was one of the most trusted members of the Confessing church that resisted Hitler. There is one remarkable episode associated with him. He was the commander of the German occupation forces at Louvain in Belgium in the last war. While serving in that position he was so helpful to the Belgian people in the prevention of the execution of hostages and in other ways that after the war, on his return to Belgium, a dinner was organized in his honor by the citizens of Louvain.*

world could produce some good results again. But in spite of all optimism, it does not do so. And that makes us particularly angry. For we are firmly convinced that this is always the fault of the others, even when we sometimes cannot say whom we would include under that heading! But anyhow it cheers us up to think that it is the others who are responsible—perhaps the only cheering fact in this depressing world.

People are not afraid either of saying what they think, and so one very soon finds out in Europe, as in America, Asia or Africa, against what the general dissatisfaction is directed. Of course the Nazis are primarily responsible for our plight. No one in the world (including the East) doubts this explanation; even in Germany very few people seriously dispute it. But then some assert: "It was the victorious powers who first encouraged Hitler, by their passive acquiescence in his disgraceful actions, finally crowning their anxious policy of appeasement in Munich"; "Western democracy has failed completely"; and "the Army of Occupation behaves even worse than the S-S ever dared to do" (that is the trump card).

"Kill the rich people, the fat bourgeois and the aristocracy, the exploiters of the poor, the trade-unionists who are hangers-on to the reactionaries and have betrayed the working classes, the deadly enemies of the proletariat"—these are the phrases heard behind the Iron Curtain. And the echo comes back from across the Atlantic: "Arm for war with the Russians, those monsters of the totalitarian state, oppressors of freedom, rabid opponents of any modest standard of living, uncomfortable disturbers of our peaceful money-making lives."

No, it has been the Germans ever since Frederick II and Bismarck, those Prussian Junkers, those goose-stepping brawling officers!

No, it has been the French who have been plotting to gain control of central Europe ever since the days of King Philip Auguste, about 1200, and even worse at the time of Richelieu and Louis XIV, and again during the French Revolution and under Napoleon!

No, it has been the English, those ruthless, unscrupulous pacemakers with their colossal colonial empire, those pious hypocritical shop-keepers and arrogant Lords!

No, it is the Americans, those prophets of big business, those merciless exploiters of the colored races, oil-magnates, money-bags! It's the others, always the others!

Have we not heard this expression before, under different circumstances? We seem to have been familiar with it ever since we were children, during our school-days, at the university, in the military service and in the business world. It was always the others when any quarrel arose, when any undertaking proved a failure, when a fortune was frittered away, when hopes sank, or when a young love was cut off in full bloom. Whose fault was it—the

man's or the woman's? At any rate it was always the other person! Ever since man's fall from Paradise, the bitter complaints and accusations have been reiterated millions and millions of times on these lines, and they have poisoned the atmosphere.

We do not worry so very much about the question, from what kind of world the others come—these people of whom we complain. We form no idea of their world, for there is nothing about it in the illustrated papers in the mornings, in the train or the bus.

What do we know then about the troubles of these other people? About the convulsions affecting the very foundations of the British Empire, where an organic change is taking place in a structure that has taken centuries to build? About the impoverishment and daily distress of the British people? About the difficulties of the Dutch in the Indonesian islands, where a colonial empire has come to an end, and the attempts to achieve greater freedom under actual conditions fail owing to the complicated social and political background? About the meaning of the political crisis in France, a visible example of the universal schism of the world—France being like an experimental laboratory of all present antagonisms of the world? About the terrible obstacle her internal difficulties constitute for all efforts towards European unity and, beyond it, a true reconstruction of our modern society? About the economic, social, racial and home-political conditions of life in the U. S. A.? About the amazing independence of its component States, similar to the Cantons of Switzerland? About the historical and sociological reasons for the remarkable fact that in this land of highly-developed modern industry they still manage on the old two-party system, and that in spite of all the gigantic tensions they have hitherto been spared any great revolutionary upheavals? Or about the dangers which threaten this great power across the Atlantic, whose tremendous vitality is laden with dynamite? About Germany, with its peculiar history in the heart of Europe, half-way between north and south, between the countries descended from the old Roman Empire in the West and the Slav civilization of the East from which no natural frontier divides it? About the causes of Germany's isolation—both real and psychological—within the family of nations even before 1933? About the opposition today to Germany's desire for reconstruction and a new beginning? About the great uncertainty prevailing there concerning Germany's relations with its neighbors, agrarian or industrial? Is it to face towards the East or the West? Is its government to be centralized or federal? democratic or authoritarian?

What do we really understand about the essential nature of the Anglo-Saxon democracies, about their bases which are historically eminently Germanic? About their spiritual and religious background? About their amazing cultural and political achieve-

ments? But also about their critical position today? What do we know about Russia and about the Eastern world to which it is the gate?

We Germans often see the external side of things, without understanding their internal development. We see the results of the catastrophic events, but not their causes. Although a glance back at history would open our eyes. We often regard something as our strong point, when it is really our weak one, and call something a humiliation which really brings the most fruitful opportunities for new growth. We Germans wait for foreigners to determine our destiny, instead of shaping it ourselves in accordance with our own analysis. We fall for any kind of slogan (as so often before), instead of taking the trouble to think out our political views in a sober and unprejudiced way.

But above all we scarcely perceive that behind the external signs of the increasing menace to human existence as a whole, behind the sins of the powers in the past and the offences committed by the countries in power today, there lurk satanic forces waiting to break through. The mass-murder of Jews in Nazi gas-chambers, and the atrocities in the concentration camps of various colors, cannot be explained solely by human passion nor the spontaneous actions of individuals. Human wickedness and weakness is directly connected with the reality of "the Powers of Darkness" in a way which is as mysterious as it is terrible, and we all have good reason not to close our eyes to the fact!

But how are we to get the right outlook on all these questions, if we have no clear conception even of ourselves? In political, economic, social and religious calculations, man himself is more of an unknown quantity than any other factor; simply because for a century men and women have been deliberately ignored, betrayed, oppressed and literally killed off in two world wars. The last remnants of human dignity have been destroyed in the dungeons of the despotic powers.

Yes, human beings have been recognized and used as labor in agriculture, as screws in the industrial machine, as numbers to swell the armed forces, as votes in elections, as supporters of the totalitarian State, as corpses in a mass grave sacrificed for some fanatical idea. But they have been ignored as living beings created in the image of God. Here is the root cause of our incapacity to establish human fellowship.

One can work for ages with one's mate on the same building, sit with one's colleague in the same office, listen with one's fellow students to the same lectures, without having the vaguest idea what he is really like. One may be one of the most respected members of the church, attend services and do successful work on its committees, without caring a hang for the human tragedy that is going on at one's very elbow. Speeches are made at silver weddings,

when for 20 years the only link between the husband and wife has been a convenient domestic background. One is proud of one's children (though why should one be?) and thinks one's daughter pretty and clever, and one's son promising or no good; but one has never learned to read the soul of one's children nor to study the problem of the difference between the generations except in the comic papers.

Above all, one's own personality is a complete terra incognita. That is not surprising. In Germany personality was not developed among young people, in the Hitler youth it was sacrificed to the mass, in the S-S it was completely denied, on the battlefield it was not exactly cherished, and in the competitive struggle of today, in the desolation, poverty and joylessness of the refugee it is (so to speak) ploughed in.

But even under more favorable conditions, when we are enjoying prosperity, unlimited freedom and opportunities for self-development, things are no better. One is still a slave of the machine, a man who never has time for anything, a man without a soul.

Have we any souls of our own? Or are we merely bread-winners, beasts of burden, cinema-goers, gramophones repeating every sensational rumor, engines for starting highly technical or organizational work, or at best sexual beings? Do we think of ourselves merely as car-owners, recipients of state assistance, tax-payers or just contemporaries? Or have we any sense of the value of our real destiny? Are we merely vegetating, or do we feel ourselves to be responsible persons? Are we really men and women or are we too busy even for that?

It is part of the nature of "modern man" that he has no answer for these questions. His vocabulary does not even contain the words for the subjects raised here. He works, he slaves, he is hungry and cold, he scrapes his way along, he pushes his way without scruple and is pushed aside in his turn, he takes such amusement as he can find, he grumbles and uses his elbows. But he has lost any real sense of connection, he has no mature convictions, and above all he has no idea of conscience. So he goes through life rather anonymously, with no real purpose and no real happiness, a stranger even to himself, and yet incapable of leaving his mechanical existence and replacing it by an effective life. Finally he gets disgusted with himself. He takes poison or hangs himself.

For behind this loss of personality lurks the menace of the Unknown. It means not only the impossibility of creating human fellowship; it means absolute NOTHINGNESS. As if pursued by insane terror, we are fleeing from ourselves. We cannot bear our past, we cannot bear our daily routine, our marriage, our fellow men, and we stare hopelessly into the darkness of a relentless future. We do not understand our own fate; we do not understand the

victors nor the vanquished. And above all, we do not understand ourselves, though we live under the illusion that we know all about ourselves. That is the worst of it! We do not know what to think nor what to hope for. We can no longer distinguish friend from foe, nor make up our minds whether the impending Third World War between East and West should be regarded as a means of annihilation or as a means of salvation!

At this godless culmination of the technical age and on the verge of the abyss, modern man comes face to face with the strangest and greatest of all unknown factors: the church.

For a long time the church has been ignored by modern people. But now it is re-appearing on their horizon. In all sorts of ways, but usually through *Hilfswerk*. Interest in the church has grown enormously, not only in Germany but also in the giving countries. Less through what it has achieved than through what people think it ought to achieve: not only should it send CARE parcels, but it should also send children and invalids to Switzerland, trace missing persons in Russia, bring prisoners home, help people to emigrate to South America, restore the Eastern Zone to Germany. And of course it should arouse the conscience of the world, although people today have no idea what conscience is.

People's ideas about the church are not very clear. But they think it might come in useful some time as a general factotum, as a voice of consolation, as an insurance in case there is a future life, and (an occasional whisper) as a final refuge in despair. So they wait expectantly outside the doors of the church. Will those doors open to us? Will they bring disappointment? Shall we find there what we need and what we are unconsciously longing for, for we are at our wit's end? What we need is a sign-post, a spiritual help, a home. Unfortunately, however, the church has very often failed to meet these needs at all.

Far more important than modern man's conception of the church is the church's own inadequacy—the question whether the church has any idea for what and to whom it is sent. Does the church really go out to meet men today, as they wander along their anxious and dangerous path, or does it only imagine that it does so? I mean the actual men and women around us, and not some pious abstractions! And I mean a real contact with them, not merely a sermon to everyone in general, which usually means that the actual auditors are not seriously addressed at all.

I mean contact with the average Protestant on the fringe of and outside the church. Not the casual renewal of friendly intercourse with the usual church-going public, with the particular loyal members of the congregation, with the regular attenders at Bible courses—although things are not always perfect among them either! A real seeking for contact of this kind, wherever the opportunity occurs! A real

seeking, not a disguised, tendentious approach. The Apostolic Mission of the church means something essentially different from church propaganda and sentimental familiarity! An effort to meet people on the same plane of courageous endeavor, in face of all the urgent questions of the day. An attempt to share their perilous climb along the narrow ridge between Nihilism and Romanticism, with Chaos on one side and Tyranny on the other! Seeking him out as he struggles with innumerable temptations and ever-renewed sin! Secure in the certainty revealed in the Bible, summarized by the Apostle Paul in the fifth Chapter of his Epistle to the Romans in the striking phrase: "But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." It is just there . . . that is the triumphal song of Christendom throughout the ages! It is precisely there that we find—the Cross.

There can be no doubt that the church would like to do all this. It is quite clear that since the war and the resultant catastrophes, the church has been much more open and prepared to reach quite a wide circle of people. It does not want just to wait until people find their way to church. It wants to do its utmost to go out to meet the people of today in their own sphere, and to discuss things with them within the framework of their particular occupation. The new Evangelical Academies in Germany are remarkable examples of this attempt, and the results achieved have already been considerable. The work of the sociological institute Kerk en Wereld in Holland and of the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, near Geneva, point in the same direction.

Nevertheless one feels afraid that the church may still fall short of all that is required of it. What special rôle is the church playing in the free discussion about questions of justice, the fair sharing of the world's burdens, public law, criminal law, education, economics, settlement, housing, social politics, and neighborly relations with peoples of other countries? What responsibility is the church taking for the development of sound political judgment, for ensuring a high level of the press, for advice about marriage, for sexual enlightenment and psycho-analysis?

The church should intervene and speak, not by interfering in matters concerning the State or local government, but by making its own indispensable contribution from its own point of view. The church must not always talk down from the pulpit and in clerical robes. It will speak much more effectively in ordinary dress, as a Christian team drawn from all classes and occupations. It will speak not only intellectually but first and foremost through action, which releases real understanding, creates real energy, dries real tears and promises real forgiveness for real sins.

The church cannot spread its sails too far, nor have too deep or personal a conception of its own spiritual task. A broadening of the church's outlook and of its responsibility in the spheres where the political and social destiny of our people is determined. And

on the other hand a renewal of the New Testament consciousness that the message of the church loses its meaning unless it approaches individual people with the direct Thou of intimate friendship. We need both and we must ask God for both.

The pastor alone cannot possibly fulfill this task adequately. Not even if his duties were to assume quite a different form from those he fulfills today.

Some churches may have more varied ways of expressing their message than the Evangelical Churches. The churches which grew out of the Reformation cannot cut themselves off completely from the Theological College of the Late Mediaeval University; they have undoubtedly been enriched thereby, but they have also been burdened for centuries. It is not at all clear that, when Christ instructed His disciples to go out into all the world, He was referring to the complicated discussions of theological experts at modern conferences; or whether Dr. Martin Luther, under the *viva vox evangelii*, had in mind the brilliant development of special oratorical gifts and the one-sidedness of the typical Protestant service. For the reality of the church includes very varied expressions of its life: praise and intercession, preaching and response from the attentive congregation, active participation in church

life and humble acceptance of the divine grace in the Holy Sacrament. All this together gives the total picture of the New Testament *Ekklesia*. It therefore does not signify an ultra-Calvinistic laicism, a high-church crypto-Catholicism nor a Lutheran confessionalism, if we try to take all the elements of the Early Church seriously and interpret them to modern man, so that his soul can breathe the fresh air again.

We must take all these elements seriously, because the church still has its mission to perform, and woe betide us if we no longer realize it. Its mission is to a world which does not know God and does not wish to know anything about a living God. But it is a message to "the weary and heavy-laden" on the long pilgrimage of life, to the questioners and seekers, to the guilty and forlorn. It has one joyful message to proclaim, entrusted to it by its Lord: that "the bondage is now at an end" and that in the Crucified and Risen Christ the Kingdom of God has become a reality among us here and now. The only reality that matters!

May God send us men and women filled with His spirit, who have understood this message and will pass it on. Then "the Church" will really come face to face with "the World."

The World Church: News and Notes

Conservatives Agree with Labor

Some intelligent visitors to the Conservative Party Conference at Llandudno came back somewhat perplexed or displeased by what they felt was a lack of conservatism. This was more especially in the economic provisions of the program which is now being drafted, as far as they were foreseen. A Correspondent of "The Observer" even spoke of "the wide agreement that exists between the Tory and Labor Parties," since it was made pretty evident that the Conservatives, if returned to power, would change little of the economic policies now being pursued by the Government and would quietly accept most of the changes that Labor has made in industrial organization. We should, then, still be living in a world of export priorities and an all-but Crippsian austerity for the home consumer; and as to nationalization, the Tories' acquiescence in what has been done may be rather reluctant, but appears to be so complete that it may considerably cramp their style when they come to that argument over the Iron and Steel Bill which so many suppose—we think mistakenly—will be their main line of attack in the coming General Election. In recent big Conferences of their Labor opponents we have long noticed an increasing disregard, or a side-tracking, by the platform, of the resolutions most vociferously urged from the back of the hall; and it appears that in a Conservative Conference we now have much the same relation between the "front-bench" steersmen and the deeper-blue elements in the back rows. The main reason for this undoubted approximation of views between the leading minds of such eternally opposed factions is the situ-

ation of the country. As governments enter into greater responsibility for its economic as well as political welfare, the necessity of the country to earn its living as one productive and trading unit among the others, constrains all governmental thinking. The area of moral maneuver open to a Cabinet in this field is limited. They find themselves obliged to do many of the same things, new and not popular things, whether they have to justify them to a Labor or Conservative clientèle.

If Mr. Attlee and Mr. Bevin have made the ranks of Labor accept a foreign policy which they never expected, the Conservative leaders are likely to reconcile their followers to a good deal of the "control" they so much dislike, and even of nationalization. This does not mean that these things would not be done with different aims under the two different Parties.

The New English Weekly.

Chinese Crisis Called Challenge to Christians

Speakers at the 13th biennial meeting in Shanghai of the National Christian Council of China laid stress on the view that the current Chinese crisis contains a challenge for Christians.

W. T. Wu of the YMCA declared that "we miss the whole point unless we realize that the present situation is a symptom of a dying order and the birth pangs of a new order."

The Rev. Frank Price, veteran missionary serving as rural work secretary of the Church of Christ in China, asserted that the present crisis was full of hope and opportunity for the Christian church.

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	LISTON POPE
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
GLOSTER MORRIS, <i>Secretary</i>	

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	JOHN A. MACKAY
CHARLES W. GILKEY	RHODA E. McCULLOCH
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	FRANCIS P. MILLER
UMPHREY LEE	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS	

Another speaker, T. H. Sun, dean of Cheloo University, said the Chinese church was still leaning "too heavily" on Western churches and has not yet produced a leadership capable of "integrating the riches of the Chinese culture with the Christian faith."

Religious News Service.

Canadian Clergy Fight Restriction Of Religious Broadcasts

Restrictions on religious broadcasts in Canada have produced a flood of protests to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Under a new policy of the CBC, church services are not permitted on the air after 5 p.m. on Sundays.

Toronto Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church voted to send a written protest to Acting Prime Minister Louis S. St. Laurent as well as to the CBC, and to ask other presbyteries to do the same.

Periodical Division
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-49

The Rev. D. M. Kerr said contact had been made with the CBC governors, but no attention had been paid to the plea of the clergy.

"Even independent stations cannot put on a religious program Sunday night without the permission of the CBC," said Mr. Kerr. "We must check the drift toward secularism on Sundays."—Religious News Service.

South Africa Bars Anglican from UN Meeting

The Rev. Michael Scott, Anglican clergyman and militant champion of Africa's non-white races, has cancelled a projected air trip to London rather than surrender his passport to a Ministry of Interior official at Johannesburg airport.

Dr. Scott said he had intended to proceed from London to Paris, where he planned to present a petition to the United Nations General Assembly on behalf of the Herero native tribe, which is opposed to South Africa's proposal to incorporate South West Africa in the Union.

Herero tribesmen, Dr. Scott declared, had asked the United Nations to hear their petition that South West Africa be made a mandated territory under trusteeship. However, he added that the action of the Interior Ministry had prevented him from presenting the tribesmen's petition.

Dr. Scott recalled that he had attended United Nations General Assembly last year to present a memorandum on behalf of the Herero tribe. He said the tribesmen were refused a hearing by Prime Minister Malan when the latter visited South West Africa recently.

The Anglican minister served a prison sentence last year for joining Indian passive resisters who had defied the Union government's new land tenure laws.—Religious News Service.

Missionaries in Chinese Communist Areas

According to a report received at the Presbyterian headquarters in Shanghai from mission officials in Tsingtao, about 200 miles from Tsinan, American and British missionaries in Communist-held Tsinan are "safe and well." "All foreigners in Tsinan are well and engaged in useful employment," the report said. "There are no financial or food problems, and the Cheloo mission has been spared, although some damage to property has occurred."

The report indicates that "the Communists are continuing their new policy of protecting missionaries, especially medical workers."

E. P. S., Geneva.

Authors in This Issue:

Clarence T. Craig is Professor of New Testament at Yale Divinity School and was the Secretary of Section One at the Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council. The article in this issue is a report on that Section, and is the first of a series of similar reports.

Reinold von Thadden was a member of the World Council staff in charge of particular German problems, and was formerly chairman of the Student Christian Movement, and one of the guiding lay leaders in the Confessing Church of Germany during the war.